

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 and 47-61 were pending. Claims 1, 25, and 47 are currently amended.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Summary of Interview

The undersigned representative thanks the Examiner for his time in conducting an interview on July 6, 2007, the relevant portions of which are summarized herein in accordance with MPEP §713.04. The Examiner's rejections of claims 1 and 47 under 35 USC 103 in view of Phelps were discussed. During the interview agreement was reached that claims 1, and 47, as amended herein, overcome the rejections and sufficiently distinguish the claimed subject matter over the cited art. Specifically, it was agreed that the recitation of the limitation "user actions performed on a plurality of articles" in claims 1 and 47 sufficiently distinguished the claimed invention over Phelps.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 102(e)

In the 1st paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 25 as allegedly being anticipated by Musgrove et al., US Publication Number 2005/0065909 ("Musgrove"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 25 has been amended to recite features similar to those of claims 1 and 47 directed to a user-context-dependent search, based at least in part, on a user action history. As amended, claim 25 recites:

automatically searching a local article index with a user-context-dependent search query for a search result associated with the aspect, **wherein the user-context-dependent search query is based, at least in part, on a user action history comprising a plurality of user actions performed on a plurality of articles;**

Musgrove does not disclose these features. Musgrove is solely directed to a product placement engine which displays products as advertisements based on keywords.

Musgrove fails to disclose “automatically searching a local article index with a user-context-dependent search query for a search result associated with the aspect, **wherein the user-context-dependent search query is based, at least in part, on a user action history comprising a plurality of user actions performed on a plurality of articles**”. The system disclosed in Musgrove is limited to the product placement engine and does not teach or disclose “**a user-action history**”. As the Examiner states in his rejection, the “**local article index**” in Musgrove is a **product database**, not an index of articles local to the user upon which the user performs searches and actions. In his rejection of claim 25, the Examiner states that Musgrove discloses a user-context-dependent search query as the user requests the search. However, Musgrove fails to disclose “a user-context-dependent search query is based, at least in part, on a user action history comprising a plurality of user actions performed on a plurality of articles”.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claim 25, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over Musgrove.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 103(a)

In the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-5, 8, 11-24, 47, 49-51, 54 and 57-61 is allegedly begin unpatentable over Tripp et al., US Patent number 6,976,053 (“Tripp”) in view of Phelps.

As suggested by the Examiner claims 1 and 47 have been amended to recite:

generating a user-context-dependent search query based, at least in part, on a user action history comprising a plurality of user actions performed on a plurality of articles

As discussed in the aforementioned interview, the claimed invention is directed to the generation of search queries based on “a user action history comprising a plurality of user actions **performed on a plurality of articles**”. Phelps merely discloses setting search options and fails to disclose “a user action history comprising a plurality of user actions **performed on a plurality of articles**”. Tripp does not remedy the deficiencies of Phelps.

Based on the above amendment and the remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 47 are patentably distinguishable over Trip and Phelps, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner. Claims 3-5, 8, 11-24, 49-51, 54 and 57-61 depend from claims 1 and 47. Additionally, claims 3-5, 8, 11-24, 49-51, 54 and 57-61 recite features not disclosed by the cited art. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3-5, 8, 11-24, 49-51, 54 and 57-61 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
David B. Auerbach et al.

Date: July 23, 2007

By: /Brian Hoffman/

Brian M. Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (415) 281-1350